

To: [Nonresponsive Based on revised scope]@tetrattech.com [Nonresponsive Based on revised scope]@tetrattech.com]
From: Wagner, Christine [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=12068C1889924ECF96F692831F0C77D4-CWAGNE02]
Sent: Wed 9/16/2020 8:28:41 PM (UTC)
Subject: FSP Corrections
CW-markup-Shiloh Church Road Removal AMP FSP 091320 Revision 01 ew TAT.docx



Thank you for making changes. This document is much improved. Most of my changes are minor and can simply be accepted. However, a few major issues still need to be resolved. Was START able to access the EPA Scribe file for the Site?

1. We are not using VIPER to log our air monitoring data. This section needs to be rewritten to reflect what we actually do.
2. I'm not entirely comfortable with the nomenclature, simply because we are not "starting" the Site.. We already have lots of "SS-01"s in scribe. The way this paragraph is written will only confuse me. Wherever possible, we need to include the original Site "Area" in our nomenclature. For example, this will be extremely important for Area 9. There is lots of data in SCRIBE already for Area 9. At some point down the line, I want to be able to pull all of that data and relate it to area 9 Tt data. This plan does not plan for that. Please have Cha take a harder look at the data in Scribe and bring some suggestions to the team.
3. Why are VOCs listed in the soil samples? Is this for the drum area. We did not include the drum area in this plan and that's ok. I thought we would create a separate addendum for that area much later down the line after EPA makes some decisions in this area

If we have heavy rain tomorrow, I recommend [] go to the Brookneal location and take a harder look at Scribe. It is important that we can tie the old data to the new data in some way. I am open to suggestions here, but I do not want to spend months having START "straighten out the data". Just writing that sends shivers down my spine

Otherwise, most of the changes were made to make this a more useful document.

EPA's QAPP team will want an org chart in the SSQAPP. Not sure if there is one, but if so, please add it. I only know this because other OSCs' plans got flagged on this. I personally don't think this is necessary, but it's not a battle worth the fight.

Thank you